

1:09-CR-126

1:18-CV-106

Mr Collier

This is very important sir and is most urgent to my case. My intention is not to waste your time.

I didn't have the money on my account to print this because I'm indigent, but this is word for word off the criminal law reporter on our computers. If you research it you will see for yourself.

RECEIVED

AUG 06 2018

Clerk, U. S. District Court  
Eastern District of Tennessee  
At Chattanooga

It said

"Violence law struck down after lie court vagueness ruling."

"A recent US Supreme Court decision striking down a vague immigration law led the US court of appeals for the 10th Circuit May 4th, to strike down a similar criminal law."

The lie courts April 17th due process ruling in Sessions v. Dimaya, tossing crime of violence language in the immigration law, prompted the 10th circuit to do the same with a criminal provision 18 USC § 924(c)(3)(B).

Former 10th circuit judge now Justice Neil M. Gorsuch joined the courts 5-4 ruling for the immigrant in Dimaya. Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr warned in dissent that the ruling could be used to strike down other laws like the one the 10th circuit tossed here.



②

The law here used to punish Clifford Raymond Salas for firebombing a tattoo parlor with a molotov cocktail. It was a destructive device, used to commit a crime of violence under the criminal law

But the crime of violence language is too vague under the Identically worded criminal law for the same reason it was too vague under the imagrashon law in dimaya. Judge Paul J. Kelly JR wrote for the court. " end quote

U.S. v. Salas 2018 BL 158863  
10<sup>th</sup> Circuit 16 2170 5/4/18

Mr Collier. I know I've written a few times and I know your very busy. I mean no disrespect. Please take this into consideration. 924(C)(3)(B) the residual clause definition of a crime of violence. It had to be used in my case to distinguish what "could have happened as a basis to give me a 924(C) enhancement. 924(C)(3)(B) was a definition saying a substantial risk that physical force "May be used" in the course of committing the underlying crime. "Attempted bank robbery".



(3)

Saying there is a "risk" that force "May be" used in the course of the Attempted bank Robbery is too speculative. There is a "risk" the world will end tomorrow. The moon "May be" shot out of the sky tomorrow but there is no real world facts.

A lot of peoples 924c enhancements still stand because of the use of force 924(CX3)(A) law. 924(CX3)(B) doesn't invalidate all enhancements.

Any 924c enhancement that is bound to the underlying charge by this vague definition 924(CX3)(B) is unconstitutional.

Meaning Prosecutors can no longer use 924(CX3)(B) as a tool to build a "what if" scenario. My crime was all "what ifs."

Mr Collier thank you for your time and considering these issues.

John Floyd Thomas  
42426 074  
July/28/2018

1:09-CR-126

1:18-CV-106